

1 JASON M. FRIERSON  
 2 United States Attorney  
 3 District of Nevada  
 4 Nevada Bar No. 7709  
 5 R. THOMAS COLONNA  
 6 Assistant United States Attorney  
 7 REEM BLAIK  
 8 Assistant United States Attorney  
 9 Nevada Bar No. 16386  
 10 501 Las Vegas Blvd. South, Suite 1100  
 11 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101  
 12 (702) 388-6336  
 13 [Richard.Colonna@usdoj.gov](mailto:Richard.Colonna@usdoj.gov)  
 14 [Reem.Blaik@usdoj.gov](mailto:Reem.Blaik@usdoj.gov)  
 15 Attorneys for Federal Defendant

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

10 Deandre Michael Howard,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 United States of America; DOES I through  
 14 X, inclusive and ROE Business Entities I  
 15 through X, inclusive,

16 Defendants.

Case No. 2:22-cv-01004-JAD-DJA

**Federal Defendant's Motion for Leave  
to Extend Time to File Motion for  
Exception from Attendance  
Requirements for Settlement  
Conference**

**(First Request)**

17 Pursuant to the Court's Orders (ECF Nos. 73–74) and Local Rules ("LR") 26-3 and  
 18 IA 6-1, the United States of America, by and through the Federal Bureau of Investigations  
 19 ("FBI") (collectively "Federal Defendant"), hereby respectfully moves this Court for an  
 20 order granting leave of Court for Federal Defendant to file its Motion for Exception from  
 21 Attendance Requirements for Settlement Conference ("Exception Motion"). The Exception  
 22 Motion was due on October 25, 2024, but was inadvertently not filed due to a clerical  
 23 mistake. Upon discovering this mistake, on October 28, 2024, Federal Defendant conferred  
 24 with Plaintiff's Counsel, who consents to this requested extension. This is Federal  
 25 Defendant's first requested extension.

**I. Introduction**

26 The Court ordered a mandatory settlement conference in this matter, which is  
 27 calendared for November 8, 2024, at 10:00 AM. *See* ECF Nos. 73–74. The Court's Order

1 Setting Settlement Conference requires “a representative with binding authority to settle this  
 2 matter up to the full amount of the claim to be present for the duration of the SC,” and that  
 3 any requests for exceptions to such attendance requirements be made at least 14 days before  
 4 the conference. *See* ECF No. 73 at p. 1. Federal Defendant intends to seek exception to this  
 5 attendance requirement, and respectfully requests leave of Court to belatedly file this request  
 6 due to excusable neglect.

## 7                   **II. Points and Authorities**

8                   Federal Defendant respectfully moves for an order granting leave of Court to file its  
 9 Exception Motion, due to excusable neglect. LR 26-3 states that “[an extension] request  
 10 made after the expiration of the subject deadline will not be granted unless the movant also  
 11 demonstrates that the failure to act was the result of excusable neglect.” *See* LR 26-3. This  
 12 Court has noted that excusable neglect encompasses situations in which the failure to  
 13 comply with a filing deadline is attributable to negligence or omissions caused by  
 14 carelessness. *See Wells v. McMahon*, No. 318-cv-00297-LRH-CBC, 2019 WL 1779566, at \*5  
 15 (D. Nev. Apr. 22, 2019) (citing *Lemoge v. United States*, 587 F.3d 1188, 1198 (9th Cir. 2009)).  
 16 In determining whether the excusable neglect standard has been met, courts examine four  
 17 factors: (1) the danger of prejudice to the opposing party; (2) the length of the delay and its  
 18 potential impact on the proceedings; (3) the reason for the delay; and (4) whether the  
 19 movant acted in good faith. *See Bateman v. U.S. Postal Serv.*, 231 F.3d 1220, 1223–24 (9th  
 20 Cir. 2000).

21                   Federal Defendant intends to request an exception to the representative attendance  
 22 requirement outlined in the Court’s Order Setting Settlement Conference (ECF No. 73).  
 23 Such a request was due on October 25, 2024. *See* ECF Nos. 73–74. Federal Defendant’s  
 24 failure to file this request is excusable under the applicable four-factor test. First, allowing  
 25 Federal Defendant to file its Exception Motion will not unfairly prejudice Plaintiff, as the  
 26 Exception Motion will be filed on October 28, 2024 (one business day after the original  
 27 deadline). Further, Plaintiff’s Counsel consents to the filing of this instant motion.  
 28 Moreover, Federal Defendant’s Exception Motion will have no substantive effect on

1 Plaintiff, as the Exception Motion is a routine filing that only requests permission for the  
2 undersigned AUSAs to represent Federal Defendant at the settlement conference, rather  
3 than having multiple government officials (often from various locations) attend the  
4 conference. Federal Defendant's Exception Motion, if accepted, will not hinder the  
5 proceedings in this case—but rather expedite matters and also conserve resources. Second,  
6 the length of the delay and potential impact on proceedings are minimal, as the Exception  
7 Motion was due on Friday, October 25, and is now being filed on Monday, October 28.  
8 Third, Federal Defendant's delay was due to an inadvertent clerical issue. While the United  
9 States Attorney's Office's docketing system tracks deadlines, the attendance exception  
10 deadline was inadvertently not calendared following the rescheduling of the settlement  
11 conference from October 21, 2024, to November 8, 2024. *See* ECF Nos. 73–74. Federal  
12 Defendant's delay in seeking an exception to the attendance requirement was due a clerical  
13 calendaring error. This error was a regrettable mistake and was not done in disregard of this  
14 honorable Court's orders. Lastly, this motion is brought in good faith. Counsel for Federal  
15 Defendant sought to correct this issue as soon as it was discovered on October 28, and did  
16 so by immediately contacting Plaintiff's Counsel and filing this instant extension request.  
17 Federal Defendant ultimately seeks to conserve the time and resources of the Court and the  
18 parties by filing its Exception Motion. If leave is granted and the Exception Motion is  
19 granted, the undersigned AUSAs will fully participate in settlement discussions on behalf of  
20 Federal Defendant.

21 / / /

22 / / /

23 / / /

24 / / /

25 / / /

26 / / /

27 / / /

28 / / /

### **III. Conclusion**

Based on the foregoing, Federal Defendant respectfully moves this Court for an order granting leave of Court for Federal Defendant to file its Motion for Exception from Attendance Requirements for Settlement Conference, due to excusable neglect caused by an inadvertent clerical mistake.

Respectfully submitted this 28th day of October 2024.

JASON M. FRIERSON  
United States Attorney

/s/ Reem Blaik  
R. THOMAS COLONNA  
REEM BLAIK  
Assistant United States Attorneys

## **IT IS SO ORDERED:**

**DANIEL J. ALBREGTS  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

DATED: 10/29/2024